



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,571	10/28/2003	Amol S. Pandit	200210160-1	9180
22879	7590	09/28/2007	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY			HERNANDEZ, NELSON D	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION			2622	
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/28/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/695,571	PANDIT ET AL.
	Examiner Nelson D. Hernandez	Art Unit 2622

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 September 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
  - a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
  - (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Response to Arguments.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
13.  Other: PTO 892 form is included (Paper. No. 20070920).

  
TUAN HO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed September 11, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicants argues the following:

"Claim 1 recites (with emphasis added):

1. A system which docks a camera, comprising:

a base; and

***a platform configured to dock with the camera and configured to couple to the base*** such that the platform may be rotated relative to the base and about an axis of rotation.

Applicants respectfully submit that Takahashi does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the above-emphasized claim features. The Office Action refers to Figure 13 of Takahashi and appears to equate the base with reference 602 and the platform with reference 604 (see page 2 of the Office Action). Applicants respectfully disagree that this new interpretation presented by the final Office Action anticipates or suggests the language of the claim. From Figure 13 of Takahashi it is clear that the element 604 is not coupled to element 602. Instead, element 604 appears to be coupled to element 702. Further, Takahashi provides the following description with regard to the structure shown in Figure 13 on page 7, paragraph [0012] (emphasis added):

The cradle 700 shown in FIG. 13 has a rotation system in a coupling portion 702 between the camera mounting unit 604 and the leg portion 602. As shown in FIG. 13, the camera mounting unit 604 is mounted rotatably on the leg portion 602 with a rotation axis 703 placed in the center parallel to the vertical direction of the

cradle 700. The user can easily rotate the camera mounting unit 604 by hand. In the case of the cradle 700 having the above-mentioned rotation system, it is preferable that the power input terminal 610 and the digital communications terminal 612 are mounted on the leg portion 602.

Applicants respectfully submit that this recited section of Takahashi and Figure 13 make it clear that Takahashi fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the above-emphasized claim limitations. Indeed, the description of Takahashi above might suggest to one having ordinary skill in the art that the elements 602, 604, and 702 provide an effect that is opposite to the alleged coupling between 602 and 604. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn." (See pages 8 and 9).

➤ The Examiner disagrees. As discussed in the previous Office Action (mailed on July 27, 2007), the Takahashi reference (as shown in fig. 13) discloses a system (Fig. 13) which docks a camera (Camera 510 shown in fig. 11), comprising: a base (Fig. 13: 602); **and a platform (Figs. 13: 604) configured to dock with the camera and configured to couple to the base** (As shown in fig. 13 and discussed in page 7, ¶ 0012, Takahashi discloses a coupling portion 702 between the camera mounting unit 604 and the leg portion 602. *The American Heritage College Dictionary* (Fourth Edition, 2002) defines the word "**coupling**" as a device that link or connect; and also defines the word "**couple**" as 1) a link; 2) Something that joins or connect two things together. Therefore, by teaching the **coupling portion 702** between camera mounting unit 604 (which, the Examiner reads as the claimed platform in the last Office Action) and the leg portion 602 (which, the Examiner reads as the last Office Action), Takahashi discloses that the platform is configured to dock with the camera and is also configured to couple to the base since by using the coupling portion 702 to connect or join together

the camera mounting unit 604 and the leg portion 602, Takahashi discloses that said platform is configured to couple to the base) such that the platform (604) may be rotated relative to the base (602) and about an axis of rotation (Note that the platform rotates about the base 602 as taught in page 7, ¶ 0111-0118); See also axis of rotation as shown in figs. 13 and 14 (See also page 5, ¶ 0094 – page 6, ¶ 0102; page 7, ¶ 0111-0118)). The Examiner notes that the structure of the platform and the base configuration as discussed in the Specifications and Drawings in the Applications appear to teach a different way to couple said platform to the base. However, the claim as written does not offer a description that differs from the Takahashi teaching.

The Arguments in regards to **independent claims 11 and 15**, and dependent **claims 2-10, 12-14 and 16-20** have been discussed and analyzed with in regards to **claim 1**.

Therefore, the rejection made on **claims 1-4, 6 and 9-19** under 35 USC § 102(e) and the rejection made on **claims 5, 7, 8, and 20** under 35 USC § 103 are considered proper and are maintained.

### **Contact**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571) 272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson D. Hernandez  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2622

NDHH  
September 20, 2007



TUAN HO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER